CI 2014 N Troy

First name: Nathan
Last name: Troy

Q1:
Q2:

The primary objective of a national classification scheme should be to provide parents with as much information as possible about content to be consumed by their children in order for them to make an informed decision about what they do and do not expose their children to. It should be parents who decide what their children see. All people over the age of 18 should be allowed to freely decide what content they do or do not consume.

Q3:

Yes, because the nature of technology nowadays is such that traditional classification like for films and books in the past is not able to be applied consistently. For example, the ubiquity of the internet means that if something is refused classification in Australia, it can be either downloaded or imported from overseas very easily, and often cheaper than it would be sold for locally as well. Mobile device applications are able to be developed easily by individuals with limited financial resources, and if developers had to submit their applications for classification, paying the fees involved very well might outweigh potential earnings for developers who are starting out, discouraging innovation and competition. Also, forced classification would strongly discourage overseas developers from selling their applications within Australia. As a university student and aspiring mobile developer myself, I would be strongly discouraged from further development by the fees if I was forced to submit my applications for classification.

Q4:

I believe that mobile applications, web pages and artwork should only be required to be classified if subject to a complaint, the first two due to the nature of the platforms they are distributed on, the latter because I believe artwork should not be censored.

Q5:
Q6:
Q7:
Q8:
Q9:
Q10:
Q11:
Q12:

There are no effective methods of controlling access to online content short of 24 hour monitoring of all internet connections in the country, which is unconscionable in a free country like Australia. Every method of restricting access to online content can be bypassed by those who know how, and it is easy to teach others who do not have that knowledge to do so as well. The internet is fundamentally different to any other communication medium and should be treated as such.

Q13:

Parental education about supervising what their childrens' computer usage and what they do online, and provision of free resources such as monitoring, filtering and security software and training in their usage to assist in doing so. Education about simple things such as placing computers in public spaces (e.g. lounge room), limiting system access through user account settings, usage of security software such as secure browsers, sandboxing software, firewalls, anti-virus.

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

To advise parents and adults about the content so that they can make informed decisions about what they or their children are exposed to. Government agencies should not restrict access to content unless it clearly violates the law. Industry bodies should participate in this process as well. Users should be left to make the decision about what they do or do not expose themselves and/or their children to, fully informed by the aforementioned bodies.

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Mobile device application classification should be subsidised if forced to be classified.

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Yes, because this would allow classification of media to be applied more consistently. Applying R18+ ratings to computer games is essential for consistent application of classification.

Q24:

No content online should be entirely prohibited. Any content that clearly violates the law should be investigated, prosecuted and removed by the relevant authorities as set out in the relevant state and federal laws, but any other content should not be restricted.

Q25:

Q26:

Consistency of state and territory classification laws is absolutely critical, and should be promoted, if not mandated by the Federal government.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: